

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 27 are pending in the application and stand finally rejected. Claims 1, 14, 24, and 26 have been amended. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner enter this amendment after final action and reconsider Claims 1 – 27.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) in view of *Barros* (US 6,307,573). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Since no rationale was provided for the rejection of Claims 8 – 10, it is assumed that the Examiner did not intend to reject Claims 8 – 10 in paragraph 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 1, 14, 24, and 26 have been amended in this response to clarify the claimed invention over the application of the newly cited *Barros* reference that was applied against these claims. The step of displaying substantially dynamic information in a dialog box associated with a same webpage as the displayed map has been amended in the aforementioned claims to include additional limitations as follows:

automatically accessing and displaying in a dialog box associated with a same webpage as the displayed map substantially dynamic information regarding the a particular lodging property indicated by the user, wherein the substantially dynamic information is provided in substantially real-time so as to be substantially current, and wherein the substantially dynamic information for the particular lodging property is automatically accessed when a pointer is moved over the location of the particular lodging property on the displayed map

Support for this amendment is found at least in paragraph 34 of the specification, and in Fig. 3, block 62 (dialog box with dynamic information).

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that *Reichert, et al.* does not teach the step of "displaying in a dialog box associated with a same webpage as the displayed map substantially dynamic information regarding the particular lodging property indicated by the user, wherein the substantially dynamic information is provided in substantially real-time so as to be substantially current" (emphasis added). The Examiner is relying on *Barros* for "disclosing displaying lodging properties on a map wherein the user can interact with the map to display substantially real-time (i.e., dynamic) information regarding the lodging property" (referring to Fig. 6d, 7d, and the descriptions thereof).

Barros discloses, at col. 17, ll. 17 – 29 that the user can click on a hotel symbol to view annotational materials in a message box and pop-up. More specifically, *Barros* discloses the following:

"FIG. 6d shows another embodiment of the GUI layout within a World Wide Web browser. The user has undertaken a search for a selection of hotels by clicking the box to the left of the topic "Lodging" and thereby called up the "Lodging" query box for selection of query criteria, 6c. A list of applicable hotels with a retrieval bar then appeared in the key area; this list may be clicked to have a particular hotel hilited on the map. The User has also clicked the key and special theme selector in 6d to view subway stops, trolley-boat tours, and scenic views. The user has then clicked on a hotel symbol on the map to view annotational material in the message box and pop-up, 6d."

As depicted in Figs. 6d and 6e, a user checks the box "Lodging" on the right control panel of the Fig. 6d GUI, then selects lodging criteria in the separate GUI (i.e., another webpage) of Fig. 6e, which results in a list of hotels satisfying the lodging criteria being listed on the right control panel in the GUI of Fig. 6d. However, when the user clicks on a particular hotel on the right control panel (se Fig. 10a), a pop-up appears that displays static information about the Bostonian hotel, e.g., *Bostonian weekends from \$139.*" This simply indicates that weekend room

rates for the selected hotel are priced at a special rate. There is no indication that there are any rooms available at the selected hotel, or at the rate indicated, or on the dates when the user wants to book a room. To find information on another hotel, the user would have to select that hotel on the right control panel, in order for a pop-up to display the information. Furthermore, Fig. 7d of *Barros* displays static information for predefined travel packages from an origin city to a specific destination resort. The information presented in the bottom control panel below the map in Fig. 7d lists static travel packages. The pricing information is also static. There is no dynamic information on availability of any of the packages presented in the display. The user would have to click on the "View" link to see additional information about a particular package.

In contrast, Applicant's invention, as recited in amended Claim 1, automatically accesses and displays substantially dynamic information, provided in substantially real-time, for a particular lodging property when a pointer is moved over the location of the particular lodging property on the displayed map. *Barros* fails to teach these limitations. There is no need or requirement to check any boxes or click on a list of hotels to display any information for the selected hotel, as is required by *Barros*. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of *Reichert, et al.* and *Barros*.

Claims 2 – 5, 7, 11 and 13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1. Therefore, these claims are allowable over the combination of *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) and *Barros* for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

The Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 8 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) in view of *Barros* (US 6,307,573), as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of *DeLorme, et al.* (US 2003/0182052). This rejection is respectfully

traversed. Claims 6 and 8 – 10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

The Examiner rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) in view of *Barros* (US 6,307,573), as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of *Jones, et al.* (US 7,082,400). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The Examiner rejected Claims 14 – 16, 18, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) in view of *Barros* (US 6,307,573) and *Jones, et al.* (US 7,082,400). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 14, the Examiner is relying on *Barros* for "disclosing displaying lodging properties on a map wherein the user can interact with the map to display substantially real-time (i.e., dynamic) information regarding the lodging property." Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above with respect to amended Claim 1. More specifically, in Fig. 6d of *Barros*, there is no indication that there are any rooms available at the selected hotel, or at the rate indicated, or on the dates when the user wants to book a room. To find information on another hotel, the user would have to select that hotel on the right control panel, in order for a pop-up to display the information. In Fig. 7d of *Barros*, there is no dynamic information on availability of the packages presented in the display.

In contrast, Applicant's invention, as recited in amended Claim 14, automatically accesses and displays substantially dynamic information, provided in substantially real-time, for a particular lodging property when a pointer is moved over the location of the particular lodging property on the displayed map. *Barros* fails to teach these limitations. There is no need or

requirement to check any boxes or click on a list of hotels to display any information for the selected hotel, as is required by *Barros*. Therefore, Claim 14 is patentable over the combination of *Reichert, et al.* in view of *Barros* and *Jones, et al.* Claims 15 – 16, 18, and 22 depend from Claim 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 14. Claim 23 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 14 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 14.

The Examiner rejected Claims 17 and 19 – 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) in view of *Barros* (US 6,307,573) and *Jones, et al.* (US 7,082,400) as applied to Claim 14, and further in view of *DeLorme, et al.* (US 2003/0182052). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 17 and 19 – 21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 14.

The Examiner rejected Claims 24 – 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reichert, et al.* (US 2002/0042819) in view of *Barros* (US 6,307,573), *DeLorme* (US 5,948,040), *Jones, et al.* (US 7,082,400) and *DeLorme, et al.* (US 2003/0182052). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 24, the Examiner is relying on *Barros* for "disclosing displaying lodging properties on a map wherein the user can interact with the map to display substantially real-time (i.e., dynamic) information regarding the lodging property." Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above with respect to amended Claims 1 and 14. Therefore, Claim 24 is allowable over the combination of *Reichert, et al.* in view of *Barros*, *DeLorme* '040, *Jones, et al.* and *DeLorme, et al.* '052.

Claim 25 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 24 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 24.

With respect to Claim 26, the Examiner is relying on *Barros* for "disclosing displaying lodging properties on a map wherein the user can interact with the map to display substantially real-time (i.e., dynamic) information regarding the lodging property." Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments presented above with respect to amended Claims 1 and 14. Therefore, amended Claim 26 is allowable over the combination of *Reichert, et al.* in view of *Barros, DeLorme '040, Jones, et al.* and *DeLorme, et al. '052*.

Claim 27 is directed to a computer program operable to implement the method set forth in Claim 26 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 26.

In view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claim rejections of the Examiner have been properly addressed and the pending claims are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider and enter this amendment after final action, and withdraw her rejections of the pending claims. It is also requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below should this response not be deemed to place this application in condition for allowance.

4/17/08
Date

Customer No. 26158
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE
P. O. Box 7037
Atlanta, Georgia 30357-0037
(404) 888-7412 (Telephone)
(404) 870-2405 (Facsimile)

Respectfully submitted



John J. Timar
Registration No. 32,497
Attorney for Applicant